

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-27 are pending in this application. Claims 14-22 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 2,693,165 to Appleman in view of U.S. patent 5,913,414 to Pollock et al. (herein “Pollock”). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Appleman and Pollock as applied to claim 22, and further in view of U.S. patent 3,421,474 to Demi. Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Appleman in view of Pollock as applied to claim 22, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,845,365 to Howie. Those rejections are traversed by the present response as now discussed.

Independent claims 14 and 27 are herein amended to clarify features recited therein and the features recited in those claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art, as now discussed.

Independent claim 14 now further recites “the cap including a disk portion and a gripping portion that protrudes in a diametral plane and delimits a hollow internal space”. Independent claim 14 now also further recites “wherein the cap forms a monoblock assembly with its disk portion and its gripping tab portion, and the disk portion of the cap covers the integrated mechanical base”. Those features are believed to be clear from the original specification, see for example Figure 2 showing the cap with a disk portion 22B and a gripping tab 22A, which are all integrally formed as a monoblock assembly. The disk portion 22B of the cap also covers the integrated mechanical base 21.

The above-noted structure clarified in the claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding rejection cites Appleman as the primary reference and specifically indicates Appleman discloses a cap 50. Applicants submit element 50 in Appleman is a light

diffuser that does not include a disk portion and a gripping tab portion all formed as a monoblock assembly. In that respect applicants also note Appleman specifically states “[t]he member 50 is supported within a metal retaining ring 52 which is held on a knob by a plurality of resilient tongues 54 engaging the surface 26”.<sup>1</sup> Applicants submit from such disclosure it is clear that the noted light-diffusing member 50 in Appleman is not a cap including a monoblock assembly of a disk portion and a gripping tab portion.

Further, the cap 50 in Appleman clearly does not include a disk portion that would cover an integrated mechanical base.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit amended independent claim 14 as currently written, and accordingly the claims dependent therefrom, positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Appleman in view of Pollock.

With respect to independent claim 27, independent claim 27 similarly as in independent claim 14 now further recites “the cap including a disk portion and a gripping tab portion that protrudes in a diametral plane and delimits a hollow internal space”. As noted above such feature is neither taught nor suggested by Appleman in view of Pollock.

Independent claim 27 now also recites “the angular position display pointer extending into the gripping tab portion of the cap”. That feature is believed to be clear from the original specification, see for example Figure 3 showing the angular position display pointer 27, which can extend into a gripping tab 22A of the cap 22. That additional feature is believed to be neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

With respect to independent claims 27 the outstanding Office Action indicates Appleman discloses an angular position display pointer at the “(see flat part with small point indicating the function, Fig. 1)”.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Appleman at column 3, lines 10-13.

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of May 21, 2009, page 5, lines 11-12.

In reply to that grounds for rejection it is first noted it is unclear what element is even being cited in Appleman to correspond to the claimed "angular position display pointer". Applicants also submit Appleman does not disclose or suggest any angular position display pointer that can extend into a gripping tab of the cap. Thereby, amended independent claim 27 also distinguishes over Appleman in view of Pollock.

Moreover, no disclosures in the further cited references to Demi or Howie were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no disclosures in Demi or Howie are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Appleman in view of Pollock.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written are allowable over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)